

## **GUIDELINES FOR DETERMINING ADMINISTRATIVE HOME OF GRANTS AND ALLOCATING INDIRECT COST RETURNS**

This document reviews guidelines for determining: (1) through what administrative unit (e.g., Department, Center) a grant or contract should be submitted; and (2) how credit splits (and associated indirect cost (IC) return) should be allocated across units.

An important principle is that decisions regarding unit and allocation of ICs across units should be based on what will be most beneficial to securing the grant and successfully managing the project.

These guidelines were reviewed by Department Chairs, Business Managers and the Office of Research. They will be reviewed and updated as necessary to ensure fairness and maximize research productivity as DSPH research (and interdisciplinary research) grows and as additional School-wide Centers develop.

### **GUIDELINES AROUND DETERMINING ADMINISTRATIVE UNITS THROUGH WHICH GRANTS AND CONTRACTS SHOULD BE SUBMITTED**

The administrative unit through which a grant or contract is submitted is responsible for overseeing the submission and management of a grant (pre- and post-award). This may be done with support as needed from the central Office of Research of the School.

Current administrative units allowing grant submissions at Dornsife School of Public Health (DSPH) include the four academic Departments and the Urban Health Collaborative (UHC), i.e., a School-wide Center. As the School grows, it is possible that other units may be designated as School-wide Centers and will have the ability to directly submit and manage grants (without going through an academic department). The criteria for becoming a School-wide Center are defined in the DSPH policy on School-wide Centers.

In general, it is expected that faculty will submit and manage their grants through their home Department. However, exceptions may occur for School-wide Centers as described below. It is expected that Department-based Centers will submit grants through their Departments, but this does not preclude the Department from establishing a mechanism to share ICs with a Center if agreed to by the Department Chair and the Center Director or if mandated by any School policy on Centers.

Below we describe various faculty appointments that may be linked to School-wide Centers (SC), such as the UHC, and how their grant submissions should be managed.

1. Research or clinical faculty fully administratively supported by the SC (e.g., Assistant Research Professor of X at the SC): These faculty are: housed in SC space, administratively supported by the SC, and expected to submit grants as a PI through the SC. The SC is fully responsible for the salaries of these faculty (although faculty may take on teaching roles supported by departments as described in the DSPH Center guidelines in some cases). As a result, the SC will submit and manage grants for these faculty in their role as PI. The “home Department” for these faculty for the purpose of IC returns will be the SC.
2. Tenure track faculty appointed in a DSPH Department but fully administratively supported by the SC. These faculty are: housed in SC space, administratively supported by the SC, and expected to submit grants as a PI through the SC. These arrangements apply to SC Director or

Co-Directors and to any tenure track faculty for whom this arrangement is explicitly noted in writing at the time of hiring or subsequently via an MOU between the SC and a Department. The SC will provide administrative support for these faculty and will often contribute start up costs or similar expenses associated with these faculty. As a result, the SC will submit and manage grants for these faculty in their role as PI. The “home Department” for these faculty for the purposes of IC returns will be the SC. **Note: any research buyout returns for these faculty will still accrue to their home Department.**

3. Any other faculty with primary appointments in DSPH Departments or other Drexel University units who are not administratively supported by the SC. A faculty member affiliated with the SC (e.g., SC core lead or faculty affiliate) but not administratively supported by the SC may choose to submit a project through the SC in cases when a project will benefit from being based at the SC because of significant leveraging of SC resources; because it builds on an existing SC project; or because the PI believes it is advantageous to the conduct and management of the project to be housed at the SC. In this case, IC returns will be shared between the home Department and the SC, as described below.

### **GUIDELINES FOR DETERMINING CREDIT SPLIT ACROSS UNITS**

Per current University guidelines, each PI is responsible for negotiating the “credit split” for all investigators involved in the submission of a proposal for external funding. This negotiation is completed at the time of proposal submission and approved by Department Chairs, Center Directors, the Associate Dean for Research, and the Dean. The credit split drives the flow of returned ICs to individual investigators and their corresponding units. For any one investigator, the portion of credit allotted to them can also be split between multiple units. In general, credit splits should be determined by where the work will primarily occur and reflect the allocation of direct costs. Moreover, it is expected that the unit submitting the grant will support a higher proportion of the work given the administrative burden of submitting and managing the grant.

Example A is a generic example illustrating standard IC allocation practices across Departments. Assume a project with three investigators across 3 Departments (investigators A, B and C, with investigator A as the principal investigator and B and C as co-investigators). Investigator A submits the grant through his/her Department and proposes a credit split of 50% to the PI and 25% to each co-investigator (in a multi-PI submission, the credit split would be evenly divided among the PIs). This means that **all grant IC returns** (currently at 15% of total ICs equally divided between investigators and Departments) will be split in this way: 50% assigned to the PI and his/her “home” department, and 25% assigned to each investigator and his/her home Department.

In Example A, a grant budgets 1 million dollars in direct costs and has full ICs (\$550,000 at an IC rate, i.e., 55%). In this scenario, the total return to investigators and Departments is 15% of \$550,000 or \$82,500. This is divided 50%/25%/25% across the three investigators and their Departments. Per current policy half goes to the investigators and half goes to the Department (s):

Example A: Standard allocation of ICs across Departments based on a 50/25/25 credit split across investigators			
	Investigator A	Investigator B	Investigator C
Investigator discretionary account	\$20,625	\$10,312.50	\$10,312.50
Dept/Unit of Invest A	\$20,625		
Dept/Unit of Invest B		\$10,312.50	
Dept/Unit of Invest C			\$10,312.50
Total IC return	\$41,250	\$20,625	\$20,625

Note: The Departmental/Unit allocation for a given investigator can be split between different Departments/Units if appropriate because of where most of the work or administrative burden will occur. This can be negotiated when the grant is submitted.

Based on the general model above, the following are guidelines to be followed by faculty administratively supported by the SC or other faculty submitting grants through the SC around credit splitting across units. These guidelines are intended to allocate IC returns to the submitting unit (in this case the SC) while also continuing to support the Departments.

1. Research or clinical faculty fully administratively supported by the SC: 100% of the assigned Department/Unit credit should be allocated to SC (i.e., all of the corresponding Departmental/Unit return will go to the SC).
2. Tenure track faculty appointed in a DSPH Department but fully administratively supported by the SC: 100% of the assigned Department/Unit credit should be allocated to SC (i.e., all of the corresponding Departmental/Unit return will go to the SC). This will usually be the Center Director or Directors or other faculty for whom this is explicitly noted at the time of hiring or specified via MOU subsequently.
3. Any other faculty with primary appointments in DSPH Departments or other Drexel University units who are not administratively supported by the SC submitting through SC as PI: Generally, at least 50% of the Departmental portion of the credit assigned to the PI investigator will be allocated to SC because the grant (pre and post award) will be managed by SC staff. The remaining credit will be allocated according to where project resources (human capital, equipment, subcontracts, purchased services) are being expended/managed (e.g., in cases where the project will be largely based at the SC all or almost all Departmental credit will go to the SC; if the SC involvement is smaller, only the minimum 50% of the Departmental Credit will go to the SC). This will be agreed to by the Department and the SC when the grant proposal is being developed. See example B.

Example B illustrates a case where a tenure track faculty who is not housed at the SC decides to submit the grant through the SC because it is perceived as advantageous to the project, because it will leverage existing SC projects or resources, or because most of the work will occur at the SC (with same parameters as Example A, i.e., total return to investigators and Departments is 15% of \$550,000 or \$82,500).

Allocation of the Departmental/Unit portion corresponding to Investigator A would be (at least) 50% SC and the rest to his/her home Department. (Note that in general per Drexel practice, when a grant is submitted through a department ALL the departmental portion of the PI stays with the submitting Department. However, in this case, only 50% is required to stay with the SC as a way to support Departments). If a large part of the work were going to be housed at the SC, the proportion of the Departmental/Unit assignment allocated to the SC might be larger. This would be agreed to by the PI and the units when the grant is being submitted.

	Investigator A	Investigator B	Investigator C
Investigator discretionary account	\$20,625	\$10,312.50	\$10,312.50
Dept A of Invest A	\$10,312.50		
SC	\$10,312.50		
Dept/Unit of Invest B		\$10,312.50	
Dept/Unit of Invest C			\$10,312.50
Total IC return	\$41,250	\$20,625	\$20,625

Note: If the project involves significant SC resources, more than 50% of the Dept/Unit allocation for investigators A and part of the Dept/Unit IC returns for investigators B and C could also be allocated to the SC. This will be negotiated when the grant is submitted.